

COLORADO STATE UNIVERSITY - PUEBLO PERFORMANCE PAY PROGRAM

Mission Statement:

There is hereby established a University at Pueblo, to be known as Colorado State University – Pueblo, which shall be a regional, comprehensive university, with moderately selective admissions standards. The University shall offer a broad array of baccalaureate programs with a strong professional focus and a firm grounding in the liberal arts and sciences. The University shall also offer selected master's level graduate programs.

Plan Overview\Performance Management

Colorado State University - Pueblo has a staff of 480 employees (345 are contract status and 135 are classified status). Contract staff have historically been reviewed and rewarded based on a merit system, while classified staff has been compensated according to the state classified system.

Communication and Training

Colorado State University - Pueblo will provide a hard copy of the plan via intercampus mail as well as being posted on the HR Website. Comprehensive training will be provided to all supervisors and employees on a yearly basis through the use of workshops. Training for supervisors is mandatory. For new supervisors and employees, training will be included as a component of new employee orientation. Training will be divided into supervisory training and employee training. Supervisory training will include the performance review cycle, planning (including setting goals and objectives that are measurable and related to the department and University mission, goals and objectives), performance management, coaching and feedback, performance documentation, evaluation process, and performance pay. Training for employees will include the performance review cycle, goal development, documentation, and performance pay.

Performance Plan

The supervisor and the employee will jointly develop a performance plan based on a discussion of the core competencies, the employee's job duties/knowledge, and work goals for the plan year. Employee performance plans should align with agency goals and objectives. The performance plan is a work plan written by the supervisor in consultation with the employee and must include:

- The five uniform statewide core competencies:
 - **Communication**
 - **Diversity/Interpersonal Relations**
 - **Quality Management/Customer Service**
 - **Accountability**
 - **Job Knowledge**
- The employee's major job duties, job knowledge and job priorities for the plan year.
- The employee's goals for the plan year.
- Measurable expectations of the employee's performance and how the three areas related to the overall evaluation.
 - Teamwork can be measured as a component of an individual's performance plan
- Specific training and/or professional development activities as they relate to the performance plan

All supervisors must have a factor included in their performance plan/evaluation that measures and evaluates the effectiveness of their performance management of their employees.

The result should be a performance plan that presents a clear understanding of all performance expectations. Supervisors are ultimately responsible for developing the performance plan; plans shall be completed within 30 days of the new plan year (April 30) or within 30 days of a new job assignment.

Performance Evaluation

In order to evaluate the individual's performance plan, a performance evaluation will be conducted annually for the previous twelve-month period beginning April 1 and ending March 31. Coaching and feedback are mandatory during the plan year. In addition, the supervisor and the employee will meet during the halfway point of the evaluation period (between September 30 and October 15) and conduct a mid-year progress review. The mid-year review must be documented and forwarded to the Human Resources Office by the end of the third week of October of the plan year. The supervisor and employee will review the existing plan and agree on any changes made. The performance appraisal forms will be distributed between March 1 – 31 and performed during the month of April. The President and his appointing authority designees shall be responsible for conducting a review of all employee evaluations.

The supervisor should complete an evaluation based on the employee's performance consistent with the Performance Planning and Evaluation Form. Supervisors are ultimately responsible for completing the performance evaluation; evaluations shall be completed within 30 days of the plan year (April 30). Multi-source assessment processes, where feasible, should be considered for evaluating employees. *The five uniform core competencies cannot be disregarded in the final rating for each employee.*

Upon the supervisor's completion of the evaluation, the appropriate Appointing Authority or Designee (i.e. Deans, Directors) will review the evaluation for quality and consistency before the employee's final rating is given.

Four ratings are used: Meritorious, Commendable, Proficient and Needs Improvement.

Meritorious: This rating represents consistently exceptional and documented performance or consistently superior achievement beyond the regular assignment. Employee makes exceptional contribution(s) that have a significant and positive impact on the performance of the unit or the organization. The employee provides a model for excellence and helps others to do their jobs better. Peers, immediate supervision, higher-level management and others can readily recognize such a level of performance.

- Supervisors must provide written justification for a Meritorious rating.

Commendable: This rating level encompasses the accomplished performers who consistently exhibit the desired competencies effectively and independently while frequently exceeding expectations, standards, requirements, and objectives of the job assigned. Their work has a documented impact beyond the regular assignments and performance objectives that directly supports the mission of the organization.

Proficient: This rating level encompasses a range of expected performance. It includes those employees who exhibit competency in the work behaviors, skills, and assignments for the job as well as those employees who are successfully developing in the job. These employees are meeting all the expectations, standards, requirements, and objectives on their performance plan and, on occasion, may exceed them. This is the employee who reliably performs the job assigned.

Needs Improvement: This rating level encompasses those employees whose performance does not consistently and independently meet expectations set forth in the performance plan as well as those employees whose performance is clearly unsatisfactory and consistently fails to meet requirements and expectations.

Marginal performance requires substantial monitoring to achieve consistent completion of work and requires more constant, close supervision. Though these employees do not meet expectations, they may be progressing satisfactorily toward a **Proficient** rating and need to demonstrate improvement in order to satisfy the core expectations of the position.

If a supervisor fails to prepare a performance plan/evaluation, the reviewer shall be responsible for preparation. Supervisors who fail to plan with or evaluate their employees are subject to action under CRS 24-50-104(suspension without pay for not less than one work week). Absent extraordinary circumstances, failure to timely plan and evaluate in accordance with the established timelines of this plan results in a corrective action and ineligibility for a performance award. If the individual performance plan or evaluation is not completed within 30 days of the corrective action, the rater must be disciplinarily suspended in increments of one workweek following a pre-disciplinary meeting. Statute provides, in addition, that if any evaluations are not completed by July 1, the supervisor may be demoted. If failure to evaluate by July 1 happens for two consecutive years, the supervisor shall be demoted to a non-supervisory position.

Performance Salary Adjustments

Permanent classified employees may be eligible for performance salary adjustment each year. CSU-Pueblo will continue to fund the State Total Compensation Survey as approved by the state legislature and mandated by the state constitution. Prior to the payment of annual performance salary adjustments, the State Personnel Director shall specify and publish the percentage ranges for performance levels based on the available statewide performance pay funding.

Quotas or forced distribution processes for determining the number of ratings in any of the four performance levels shall not be established.

- Employees rated as **Meritorious** and below the pay range maximum are eligible for base building up to the range maximum and non-base building above the range maximum. All awards must be base building up to the range maximum. The evaluation criteria must vary each year for **Meritorious** employees.
 - For employees rated as **Meritorious**, any portion of the performance salary adjustment amount that exceeds grade maximum shall be paid as a one-time lump sum in the end-of-July payroll.
- Employees rated as **Commendable** and below the pay range maximum are eligible for base building, performance salary adjustments. No salary adjustments are to exceed maximum of the pay range.
 - Employees rated as **Commendable** and at the pay range maximum or in saved pay above the maximum are not eligible for performance salary adjustments.
- Employees rated as **Proficient** and below the pay range maximum are eligible for base-building performance salary adjustments not to exceed maximum of the pay range.
 - Employees rated as **Proficient** and at the pay range maximum or in saved pay above the maximum are not eligible for performance salary adjustments.
- Employees rated as **Needs Improvement** are not eligible for a performance salary adjustment. For such employees the supervisor must implement a performance improvement plan or initiate a corrective action in accordance with personnel rules.

Performance salary adjustments for employees below the maximum must be base building. Base building salary adjustments are permanent and paid as regular salary. No performance salary adjustment shall exceed the set maximum of each performance rating level except for those employees rated as **Meritorious**. Appointing Authorities will make pay decisions based on the evaluations completed by supervisors and reviewers and within the system boundaries.

If CSU-Pueblo decides to pay varying percentages within a rating category, the appointing authority will publish common criteria that will be used to determine those percentages. Source of funds (e.g. cash or general), method of funding (e.g., appropriated or memorandum of understanding), and length of state service shall not be criteria.

Employees will be notified, in writing, of their performance salary adjustment no later than May 31. All performance salary adjustments are effective on July 1 and the employee must be employed on that date in order to receive a payment adjustment. The employee's current department as of July 1 is responsible for salary adjustments. Employees hired during the performance cycle will be eligible to receive the performance salary adjustment specified for their performance rating.

Employees granted an annual salary adjustment shall not be denied the adjustment because of corrective or disciplinary action **issued after the close of the previous performance cycle.**

CSU-Pueblo shall track and report performance and salary adjustment information annually to the State Department of Personnel. The report shall indicate total monies budgeted for performance awards, total performance award monies given to each employee, total monies awarded per performance category, and the total number of disputes.

Dispute Resolution

Colorado State University - Pueblo provides a review process that is designed to resolve performance management issues in a timely manner. This process has two stages – internal to Colorado State University – Pueblo and external to the Colorado State Department of Personnel. The President of Colorado State University – Pueblo has delegated the final decision-making authority in the internal dispute resolution process to the administrative directors and deans of each department. If the director or dean is the supervisor or next level supervisor/reviewer of the individual requesting the review, the final decision will be made by the appropriate appointing authority (President, Vice-President or Provost) or the Director of Human Resources. The State Personnel Director retains jurisdiction for disputes related to performance evaluations that do not result in corrective or disciplinary action.

The Colorado State University – Pueblo dispute resolution process is an open, impartial process. Informal resolution of disputes at the lowest level is encouraged.

This process applies to the Colorado State University – Pueblo Performance Pay Program only and is not a grievance or appeal process.

Although no party has an absolute right to legal representation, during the informal and formal process the employee may have an advisor of his/her choice assist him/her. The employee is expected to represent and speak for him/herself.

Employees may use the dispute resolution process without fear of retaliation.

A copy of the dispute resolution process and the name of the appropriate dean, director and appointing authority will be provided to each employee no later than February 28 of every year.

The employee shall discuss the reviewable issue with his/her immediate supervisor and attempt to resolve the problem informally prior to pursuing the formal CSU-Pueblo dispute resolution process.

The Role of the Director of Human Resources

At any stage of the internal dispute process, the employee, supervisor, next level supervisor/reviewer, dean, director or appointing authority may call on the Director of Human Resources to provide information about the dispute resolution process and/or to extend the time frames on the internal review process. The Director of Human Resources may extend the time frames on the internal process if it is determined that the extension will serve to resolve the dispute. The Director of Human Resources may be the investigator/reviewer in cases where the appointing authority is the supervisor or next level supervisor/reviewer.

What Can/Cannot Be Reviewed

Only the following matters may be disputed:

- The individual performance plan, including the lack of a plan during the planning cycle;
- The individual final overall performance evaluation;
- The lack of a final rating (in this case, a default rating of Commendable is assigned pending the outcome of the dispute resolution process);

- The application of the Colorado State University - Pueblo performance pay program, policies, or processes;
- Full payment of a performance salary adjustment.

Final resolution of the issues concerning the employee's performance plan/lack of plan, and the employee's evaluation shall occur at the internal level. Employees will have no further recourse for resolution of these issues.

The following matters may not be disputed:

- The interim rating or mid-year progress review;
- The content of the Colorado State University - Pueblo performance pay program;
- Matters related to the funds appropriated
- The performance evaluations and performance salary adjustments of other employees;
 - The amount of a performance salary adjustment unless the issue involves the application of the Colorado State University - Pueblo performance pay program.

Internal Formal Dispute Resolution Process

Request for Initial Review

- In the event the dispute is not resolved at the informal level, the employee may request, in writing, an initial review to his/her immediate supervisor within three (3) working days of the occurrence of the dispute, with a copy forwarded to the Director of Human Resources;
- The written request for review must be dated and signed by the employee. It shall present the facts, including dates, of the dispute and the desired remedy;
- The immediate supervisor shall acknowledge receipt of the request for initial review by written form;
- The immediate supervisor shall schedule a meeting to include the supervisor, employee and next level supervisor/reviewer within five (5) working days of receipt of the request for initial review. The purpose of the meeting is to discuss the issues presented in the request for review;
- Within five (5) working days of the meeting, the supervisor, in consultation with the next level supervisor/reviewer, shall answer, in writing, the employee's dispute, with a copy of the letter forwarded to the Director of Human Resources;
- Should the employee disagree with findings of the supervisor, he/she may request a review by the appropriate dean, director or appointing authority, as described in the **Final Review** process;

Request for Final Review

- If the employee disagrees with the response given by the supervisor during the initial review process, he/she may request, in writing, within three (3) working days of receiving the written response a request for final review to the appropriate dean, director or appointing authority with a copy forwarded to the Director of Human Resources. Only the issues presented during the request for initial review may be submitted;
- The dean, director or appointing authority must acknowledge receipt of the request for final review to the employee in written form. Any request for final review submitted after three (3) working days will not be accepted - the issue shall be considered closed on the basis of the written response during the initial review process;

- The dean, director or appointing authority shall schedule a meeting with the employee, supervisor, and next level supervisor within five (5) working days of the receipt of the request for final review;
- Within five (5) working days the dean, director or appointing authority shall complete his/her investigation and shall answer the employee's dispute in writing, with a copy of the letter forwarded to the Director of Human Resources.

Only issues originally presented in writing shall be considered throughout the dispute review process. Decision-makers are limited to addressing the facts surrounding the dispute and shall not substitute their judgment for that of the supervisor and reviewer, but may instruct the supervisor to;

- **Follow the Colorado State University - Pueblo Performance Pay Program;**
- **Correct errors;**
- **Reconsider a performance rating or plan;**
- **Suggest other appropriate processes.**

Decision-makers cannot render a decision that would alter the Colorado State University - Pueblo Performance Pay Program.

External Review Process

Only the application of the Colorado State University - Pueblo Performance Pay Program, policies or processes, full payment of an award, or the lack of a final rating may be submitted for review by the Director of the State Department of Personnel. For an issue being reviewed at the external stage, these individuals shall not substitute their judgment for that of the rater, reviewer or the department's dispute resolution decision maker at the internal dispute state.

- Within five (5) working days of Colorado State University – Pueblo's final decision, an employee may file a written request for review with the Director of the State Department of Personnel at:

Attention: Personnel Director
 Appeals Section
 1313 Sherman Street, 1st Floor
 Denver, Colorado 80203
 Fax 303-866-2021.

- The request for external review shall include a copy of the original issue(s) submitted in writing during the internal formal review process and the University's final written decision;
- The Director of the State Department of Personnel or designee may select a qualified neutral third party to review the dispute(s). The Director has thirty (30) days to issue a written decision, which is final and binding.
- In reaching a final decision in the external dispute stage, these individuals have the authority to instruct rater(s) to: a) follow the agency's program, b) correct an error, or, c) reconsider an individual performance plan or final overall evaluations.
 - They may also suggest other appropriate processes such as mediation.
- **Retaliation is prohibited against any person involved in the dispute resolution process.**

Colorado State University - Pueblo

Performance Planning and Evaluation Form

Rev. 9/2005

Employee Name PID #	Department	Position Number
Employee Job Title	Evaluation Period From: _____ To: _____	
Supervisor Name	Reason for Evaluation _____ Annual _____ Other (Please Specify) _____	

The performance planning and evaluation system for Colorado State University-Pueblo classified employees is a communication tool for the employee and supervisor. It is designed to promote better understanding between supervisors and employees about job responsibilities and performance expectations. It is also designed to reward excellence in job performance and directly link job performance to pay. The process should be related to the employees PDQ and the PDQ should be reviewed regularly for accuracy. Any time the PDQ has permanent and substantial changes, it should be submitted for review.

EVALUATION PROCESS

Planning Phase

By March 31 of each year, the supervisor and employee meet to discuss and/or establish the following three areas: core competencies, job knowledge/duties, and goals and the importance of each to the overall evaluation. For new employees, the Performance Plan must be completed within 30 days of date of hire. All employees shall be evaluated using the five core competencies listed on page 2: Accountability, Communication, Interpersonal Skills, Customer Service, and job knowledge; additional factors may be added. Supervisors shall list up to 5 job duties and shall also list up to 5 individual, department and/or college goals on which the employee shall be evaluated. Lastly, the supervisor shall complete the "Supervisor Planning Comments" section on page 5, obtain proper signatures, and provide a copy for the employee. If the employee disagrees with the Performance Plan, he/she shall explain the disagreement in the "Employee Comments" section on page 5.

Progress Review Phase

At midyear or as often as deemed necessary, the supervisor and employee shall meet to discuss the employee's performance and to decide if the performance plan needs to be revised. The supervisor shall provide feedback and coaching to the employee. The supervisor shall also complete the "Progress Review" section on page 5, obtain proper signatures, and provide a copy for the employee.

Year-End Evaluation

Before April 1 of each year or as often as deemed necessary, the supervisor and employee meet to discuss performance ratings. The supervisor and next level supervisor shall sign the performance evaluation form prior to reviewing it with the employee. The supervisor shall also complete the "Supervisor Overall Justification for the Rating" section on page 5, obtain proper signatures, and provide a copy for the employee. If any of the individual factor ratings are "Needs Improvement", the supervisor shall explain the reason(s) in the comments section for that individual factor; that rating may result in a Corrective Action or Performance Improvement Plan. If the employee is given an overall "Needs Improvement" rating, a Corrective Action Form shall be completed. If the employee disagrees with the year-end evaluation rating, he/she shall explain the disagreement in the "Employee Comments" section on page 5 and may pursue resolution through the dispute process as identified in the State Classified Rules and reiterated in the CSU-Pueblo Classified Performance Pay Program document.

Supervisors shall evaluate each core competency, job knowledge/duty, and goal using the following rating levels:

Meritorious (Level 4): This rating represents consistently exceptional and documented performance or consistently superior achievement beyond the regular assignment. Employees make exceptional contribution(s) that have a significant and positive impact on the performance of the unit or the organization and may materially advance the mission of the organization. The employee provides a model for excellence and helps others to do their jobs better. Peers, immediate supervision, higher-level management and others can readily recognize such a level of performance.

Exceeds Expectations (Level 3): This rating level encompasses the accomplished performers who consistently exhibit the desired competencies effectively and independently while frequently exceeding expectations, standards, requirements, and objectives of the job assigned. Their work has a documented impact beyond the regular assignments and performance objectives that directly supports the mission of the organization.

Fully Competent (Level 2): This rating level encompasses a range of expected performance. It includes those employees who exhibit competency in the work behaviors, skills, and assignments for the job as well as those employees who are successfully developing in the job. These employees are meeting all the expectations, standards, requirements, and objectives on their performance plan and, on occasion, may exceed them. This is the employee who reliably performs the job assigned.

Needs Improvement (Level 1): This rating level encompasses those employees whose performance does not consistently and independently meet expectations set forth in the performance plan as well as those employees whose performance is clearly unsatisfactory and consistently fails to meet requirements and expectations.

Marginal performance requires substantial monitoring to achieve consistent completion of work, and requires more constant, close supervision. Though these employees do not meet expectations, they may be progressing satisfactorily toward a level 2 rating and need to demonstrate improvement in order to satisfy the core expectations of the position.

Directions: During the planning phase, the first area to be discussed is **CORE COMPETENCIES**. Review the following five Core Competencies with the employee you supervise. At year-end evaluation, rate each of the competencies by placing a check mark (✓) next to the four rating levels of Needs Improvement, Fully Competent, Exceeds Expectations, or Meritorious. If one competency is more critical to the job assignment, please indicate so in the "Supervisor Planning Comments" on page 5. You may make comments in the spaces provided for each competency. You may also further define the definitions listed below or add definitions to this form. Comments are required for "Needs Improvement" ratings.

Factor: Accountability— To what extent does employee demonstrate adaptability, convey a positive and professional image of the College to others, put forth extra effort when the need arises, not abuse leave practices, demonstrate punctuality, maintain confidentiality, make good use of work time, pay attention to detail, demonstrate accuracy and follow-through, complete tasks in a timely manner, take initiative and show self-direction; behave in a business-like manner; take initiative to learn higher level or additional skills; voluntarily assist others when the need arises?

☐ Needs Improvement

☐ Fully Competent

☐ Exceeds Expectations

☐ Meritorious

Factor: Communication Skills – To what extent does employee speak and respond effectively and courteously; produce written documents using proper grammar, format and sentence structure; produce written documents which display an attractive appearance; produce written documents which clearly convey the subject and major points; keep others informed; practice effective listening skills; practice effective telephone skills; maintain sensitivity to the feelings and efforts of others; ask appropriate questions to clarify information/needs; actively listen to others; avoid gossip and negative rumors?

☐ Needs Improvement

☐ Fully Competent

☐ Exceeds Expectations

☐ Meritorious

Factor: Interpersonal Skills – To what extent does employee treat others with courtesy and respect; display a pleasant, friendly, affable attitude; contribute to a positive work environment; promote cooperation and teamwork; accept criticism and handle conflict constructively and diplomatically; demonstrate tact, diplomacy, and a positive personal regard when confronting problems with others; treat others fairly and without prejudice or bias. Also, is seen by others as someone whom they can depend on and does not initiate conflict.

☐ Needs Improvement

☐ Fully Competent

☐ Exceeds Expectations

☐ Meritorious

Factor: Customer Service – To what extent does employee answer telephone and/or in-person requests for information promptly and courteously, determine needs of internal and external customers, offer alternatives to internal and external customers if unable to handle request, show respect and helpfulness to internal and external customers, offer prompt service, maintain smooth working relations with others, demonstrate tact and diplomacy in negotiations or confrontations with others, maintain accessibility to others?

☐ Needs Improvement

☐ Fully Competent

☐ Exceeds Expectations

☐ Meritorious

Factor: Job knowledge— To what extent is the employee skilled in job specific knowledge, which is necessary to provide the appropriate quality and quantity of work in a timely and efficient manner?

☐ Needs Improvement

☐ Fully Competent

☐ Exceeds Expectations

☐ Meritorious

Directions: During the Planning Phase, the second area to be discussed is **JOB KNOWLEDGE/DUTIES**. Please list up to 5 job duties for which the employee is responsible. At year-end evaluation, rate each job duty by placing a check mark (✓) next to the rating levels of Needs Improvement, Fully Competent, Exceeds Expectations, or Meritorious. In rating each job duty, consider the following: to what extent does employee demonstrate occupational/professional competence, maintain/update job knowledge, work cooperatively with others, meet schedules and deadlines, meet a level of quality and quantity for the assignment, take responsibility for decisions made, resolve day-to-day problems? You may further define the above definition. If you wish to indicate more than 5 job duties, attach a separate page. Comments are required for “Needs Improvement” ratings.

Major Job Duty #1:

☐ Needs Improvement

☐ Fully Competent

☐ Exceeds Expectations

☐ Meritorious

Major Job Duty #2:

☐ Needs Improvement

☐ Fully Competent

☐ Exceeds Expectations

☐ Meritorious

Major Job Duty #3:

☐ Needs Improvement

☐ Fully Competent

☐ Exceeds Expectations

☐ Meritorious

Major Job Duty #4:

☐ Needs Improvement

☐ Fully Competent

☐ Exceeds Expectations

☐ Meritorious

Major Job Duty #5:

☐ Needs Improvement

☐ Fully Competent

☐ Exceeds Expectations

☐ Meritorious

Directions: During the Planning Phase, the third area to be discussed is **GOALS**. List up to 5 goals for which the employee is responsible for attaining. At year-end evaluation, rate each goal by placing a check mark (✓) next to the rating levels of Needs Improvement, Fully Competent, Exceeds Expectations, or Meritorious. In rating each goal, consider the following: to what extent does the employee meet individual, department, and/or college goals? If you wish to indicate more than 5 goals, attach a separate page. Comments are required for “Needs Improvement” ratings.

Goal #1:			
<input type="checkbox"/> Needs Improvement	<input type="checkbox"/> Fully Competent	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Expectations	<input type="checkbox"/> Meritorious

Goal #2:			
<input type="checkbox"/> Needs Improvement	<input type="checkbox"/> Fully Competent	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Expectations	<input type="checkbox"/> Meritorious

Goal #3:			
<input type="checkbox"/> Needs Improvement	<input type="checkbox"/> Fully Competent	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Expectations	<input type="checkbox"/> Meritorious

Goal #4:			
<input type="checkbox"/> Needs Improvement	<input type="checkbox"/> Fully Competent	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Expectations	<input type="checkbox"/> Meritorious

Goal #5:			
<input type="checkbox"/> Needs Improvement	<input type="checkbox"/> Fully Competent	<input type="checkbox"/> Exceeds Expectations	<input type="checkbox"/> Meritorious

Supervisor Planning Comments (Mandatory):PDQ reviewed (**required** when permanent and substantial changes are made) ☐ Yes ☐ No_____
Employee Signature_____
Date_____
Supervisor Signature_____
Date**Supervisor Progress Review Comments (Mandatory):**PDQ reviewed (**required** when permanent and substantial changes are made) ☐ Yes ☐ No_____
Employee Signature_____
Date_____
Supervisor Signature_____
Date**Overall Evaluation – Please check (✓) one box.**☐ Needs Improvement☐ Fully Competent☐ Exceeds Expectations☐ Meritorious**Supervisory Overall Evaluation Justification for the Rating (Mandatory). Please include employee strengths and areas for improvement (use additional sheets if necessary):**PDQ reviewed (**required** when permanent and substantial changes are made) ☐ Yes ☐ No_____
Supervisor Signature_____
Date_____
* Next Level Signature_____
DateI agree with this final evaluation ☐ Yes ☐ No_____
Employee Signature_____
Date_____
Human Resources Signature_____
Date

** Second Level Supervisor must sign and agree with evaluation prior to supervisor presenting to employee.*
** Please submit this form with original signatures to HR for preservation in the official employee personnel file.*

Comments from Employee (Optional unless you are disagreeing with the final overall evaluation). Attach additional sheets if necessary: